New York Tribune

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials —Advertisements
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

SUNDAY, MARCH 2, 1919

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice President; Richard H. Lee, Secretary; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, including Postage: IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

	One Year.	Six Months.	Three Months.	One Month.
Daily and Sunday	$10.00	$5.00	$2.50	$1.00
Daily only	8.00	4.00	2.00	.75
Sunday only	3.00	1.50	.75	.25
Sunday only, Canada	3.50	2.00	1.25	.50

FOREIGN RATES

Daily and Sunday	$24.00	$12.00	$6.00	$2.25
Daily only	18.00	9.00	4.50	1.50
Sunday only	8.00	4.00	2.00	.75

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

GUARANTEE

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.
All rights of republication of all other matter herein are also reserved.

No Peace in It

The effect, let us hope, of the dignified and statesmanlike discussion of the peace league project by Senator Lodge will be to lift the debate to a higher level. His abstention from personalities and partisanship was worthy of a Senator of Massachusetts. He examined not of the motives or the methods of those promoting the plan, but plain itself as shown by the text of the document which carries it. Senator Lodge is specially entitled to recognition for his refusal to degrade a great subject by bickering back talk, for long he has been a victim of the meanest sort of attack by non-peaceful advocates of peace, and the pressure to retort was strong.

Senator Lodge, now as heretofore, is advocate of the peace league principle. To gain a secure organization of the world for peace he would be willing, if necessary, to scrap the Monroe Doctrine and to disregard the advice of Washington. But he insists, if we are to make such large sacrifices, if we are to trust our future to new arrangements, that it shall be affirmatively shown that the new policy will secure peace and through it protect this country.

No serious attempt to show this has been made. Those who hysterically urge this great departure confine themselves to vague generalities about peace in the abstract, or to the trivialities of cheap abuse of those who ask for a careful scrutiny. Except the doors were tightly locked and every precaution taken against any hearing by the public, the chief proponent of the covenant has uttered not a word in explanation of the instrument which he champions. For the great silence Senator Lodge assumes there is a reason, and this is that there is a realization that the undefended are indefensible.

In the Hague convention there was no guarantee of peace, as the world sadly knows, and no adequate assurance of peace is discoverable in the misty and indefinite language of the covenant. Senator Hitchcock, as the Administration's spokesman, declares nothing in the draft forbids a war of self-defence. His precise words when replying to a query were:

"I desire to repudiate the suggestion contained in the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts that this league will, in the slightest degree, limit the privilege and duty of any nation, the United States or any other, to defend itself when attacked, to protect its territory and protect its right when invaded, either by a member of the league or by one not a member of the league."

This astonishing admission is equivalent to saying, if the covenant had been in existence in 1914, that it would not have stopped the war. Austria-Hungary, as is well known, poured her troops over the Serbian border and Germany, on twelve hours' notice to Russia and on eighteen hours' notice to France, poured German troops over the frontiers of Russia and France. The war began in an attack and in self-defence, and the covenant, if it had then been in existence, according to Senator Hitchcock, would have interposed no bar. When men talk of permanent peace they do not mean to recreate the conditions of 1914, and it is not surprising Senator Lodge, as a peace leaguer, rejects the covenant as practically valueless.

But if the covenant and the machinery it creates will not preserve peace, it makes it a certainty, if its pledges are not broken, that the United States must be a party to every war that breaks out. We are to guarantee all territories as of 1919. The United States will have but one vote in nine, yet, unless it withdraws from the league, it must stand ready to send its troops around the world. Should some country, in the management of its internal affairs, seek to punish those rising against tyranny, one can imagine with what sort of leaden hearts the soldiers of America would take ship on a mission to shoot down those struggling for liberty.

The climax of absurdity is reached as Senator Lodge makes clear, when it appears, by an authoritative interpretation from the White House, that the covenant is binding for no particular period of time, and that any power can withdraw at will. This would establish, not stability, but instability. A nation meditating an attack would escape the shame of treaty-breaking by announcing its retirement from the league.

If only Germany had possessed this right in 1914 Bethmann-Hollweg would not have been called on to make his confession with respect to Belgium. He would have said it was Germany's privilege to quit the Belgium agreement at will and that she would exercise her freedom of action. A contract revocable at pleasure without penalty is, of course, no contract, but this is the sort of contract the advocates of the covenant say it is.

By such a rope of sand it is not possible to climb to the bright domains of peace. The covenant gives no assurance of peace, or anything like it. Thus providing no safeguard, it is not strange Senator Lodge, as an intelligent peace leaguer, rejects it—is unwilling to give the Monroe Doctrine up and our good right to prepare the means of national defence and our habit of attending to our own business for such an emaciated simulacrum of a peace league.

Poor Hitchcock!

In the Senate debate, in the colloquy as to what had been said at the White House concerning Ireland, Senator Borah did not so much as impale Senator Hitchcock as Senator Hitchcock impaled himself.

Assailing the accuracy of a newspaper statement to the effect that the President at the conference said that "Ireland was to be left to the mercies of England," Senator Hitchcock opened the door to an inquiry as to what had been said, if anything, about Ireland. "The President," he replied, "practically stated nothing with reference to Ireland." "But was there no question asked?" inquired Senator Borah.

Yes, there was a question. Did the President respond? The Nebraska Senator said "No," but, quickly corrected by Senator Williams, he amended his answer as to say there was a response. It was that the league of peace had nothing to do with internal questions. The inference, of course, is that the Irish question is an internal one—that is to say, that Ireland is to be left to the mercies of the British Parliament. Senator Borah mercifully refrained from pursuing the subject further.

Senator Hitchcock having made a mess of the explanation, the faithful Tumulty tried his hand in a statement from the White House. It was a general denial that the President had used the language ascribed to him. But Mr. Tumulty did not offer himself for cross-examination. He was not forced to declare what the President had said, if anything. Happy Tumulty! Poor Hitchcock! It is much more comfortable to give out a statement to the newspapers to which there can be no come-back than to make a similar statement before inquisitive fellow Senators.

The Irish question has been adjudged an internal question by the Paris Conference. In this judgment, so far as there is any record, the President acquiesced. So it is of little consequence what he said or did not say at the White House conference. His acts have already spoken. Article X guarantees to each nation signatory to the league its territories as they may exist when signatures are attached. Ireland is to be recognized as an integral part of the British Empire. We must break our word and tear up the peace league to participate in the Irish question, an "internal question," which concerns the British Empire alone. Intelligent Irishmen so understand the arrangement, and some of those who wear green believe they know one of the reasons why Great Britain looks at the proposed covenant amicably.

Despite his discomfiture Senator Hitchcock is entitled to congratulations for the Christian spirit he displays. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, precedent demanded that he be a member of the peace commission. He was excluded. Yet his nature is so forgiving that he appeared as the President's champion in the Senate, even though he knew the figure he would cut.

Why Spartacus?

Why the German Bolshevikis elected as their patron saint Spartacus, the Thracian gladiator who held the power of the Roman Republic at bay, has been rather puzzling. Spartacus is described as an able general, a just leader who did his best to check the excesses of his men and was not unkind to his prisoners. He was not lacking in statesmanship, and saw clearly that pillage and destruction injured his cause.

It may be, however, that Liebknecht and his friends were inspired in their selection of the name not by the original Spartacus, by Spartacus I, but by Spartacus II, as it were—an eighteenth century philosophic rebel against the existing order of things. It was in the year 1776 that the sect of Illuminati—later called Perfectibilists —was founded in Germany by one Adam Weishaupt, who sometimes affected the name Spartacus. The fanatics who followed him combined in their creed a utopian equalitarianism with an exceedingly severe discipline and unquestioning submission to authority—a feature ominously suggestive of Leninism. Furthermore, one reads in the writings of Weishaupt that he proposed "to destroy, vandalize, the universe, in order to establish on the ruins of palaces and cities the reign of pastoral virtues."

This doctrine of "creative destruction," as preached by Weishaupt, did not lead, directly at least, to actual outbreaks of violence, although his teachings were, at one time, credited with considerable influence over the Jacobins of France—a hypothesis since disproved. Rather, the Perfectibilists were the parlor Bolsheviki of the eighteenth century—while the Spartacists of our days are, in a sense, Illuminati translated into the terms of the machine gun.

Tardy Scholars

Since Mayor Hylan's official family at the City Hall is deaf to his honor's precepts and demands in regard to the 9 o'clock rule for being at work, the Mayor might try the old country school plan of shaming the delinquents into promptness. The Mayor, if memory of his reminiscences serves rightly, obtained the rudiments of learning in a rural school. There was a custom in many of those country schools with reference to the discouragement of the practice of being "late." Whenever a shining schoolboy face appeared at the door after the tap of 9 the virtuous ones who were already in their seats would rise en masse and sing:

> "Tardy scholar is your name,
> Oh, I wonder who's to blame."

If the Mayor ever was unfortunate enough to be the target for such a burst of tuneful interrogation he will appreciate the effect that it might be used with good effect on boys of a larger growth. The vision of facing Mr. Hylan's official family lined up on the front steps of the City Hall intoning a question as to the reason for his lack of punctuality should deter the most confirmed sleepyhead from loitering unduly over his grapefruit and toast.

Why Newspapers Are Indifferent

The following is a sample of many letters received by The Tribune concerning which it treats:

"What spell have the meat packers cast over the press of the city to give them immunity from all editorial notice or comment? Surely, the evidence disclosed before the Senate at Washington has been sufficient to indict the 'Big Five' of every crime short of murder.

"Every reader of your paper has a direct and personal interest in the operations of this gigantic monopoly in food products, and while you storm and rave about the high cost of living, print humorous and suggestive cartoons of the fat food merchants and the emaciated consumer, still not a scratch of the pen as to the real culprits who dominate and coerce the railroads, bribe legislation and strangle all competition by foul and unfair practices."

The Heney investigation has assembled a large body of evidence alleging that the packers and parties to a conspiracy in restraint of trade, have used unfair methods to control the trade and are subject to prosecution under the Sherman and Clayton acts. Why the Department of Justice has not proceeded against them is naturally a matter of inquiry.

Nevertheless, the interest of The Tribune, like that of other newspapers, in such prosecutions, is jaded. Since the victorious Standard Oil and Tobacco dissolutions it has not appeared that the public is practically benefited by them through lower prices. A mere breaking up of combinations does not seem to bring relief to consumers.

Do the packers increase or decrease the margin between what is paid to the farmers for cattle on the hoof and what is charged to consumers for meat on the block? Mr. Heney has neglected to go into this vital issue in any thorough way. The weight of other evidence is that the packing companies do the work of conversion cheaply. It is apparently undenied that they do business on a 2 or 3 per cent margin; that is, for every dollar they receive they pay to the producers and in other expenses 97 or 98 cents. Will an enforced break-up widen or lessen this difference? If it widens it, as seems probable, will or can the consumer gain? The answer we leave to our correspondent.

The public, if its mood can be sensed, is tired of spurious and imitation remedies—is weary of barren court victories. It prefers small concerns, but to get them is scarcely willing to have the consumer pay more or to have the producer receive less. This would seem too high a price to pay to indulge the luxury of its aversion to bigness.

That the big concerns make large returns on their capital is important, but is not the vital issue. That issue, as said above, is whether the charge for service is up or down. If this charge is small, and a large profit is realized through a rapid turnover of capital, an intensive use of byproducts and the economies of doing business on a great scale, the profit rate is of secondary interest.

It would perhaps be going too far to say Mr. Heney has dodged the vital issue, but he has plainly neglected it. As his inquisitorial zeal is not questioned, the inference is he recognizes he cannot establish that the gap in price between raw and finished product is wide, or that others could do the work more cheaply.

Here is probably the reason for the indifference of newspapers of which our correspondent complains, and which he is inclined to attribute to conspiracy.

The People and the League

Public Sentiment as Portrayed in Letters to The Tribune

A Brotherhood of Ideals

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Have not President Wilson and Messrs. Taft, Morganthau, Lawrence Lowell and Henry van Dyke lost their heads, that they want us to indorse in blank a half-drawn document?

Then, again, while Mr. Wilson has great sympathy with the struggling peoples of Europe, he seems to have grown painfully simple-minded. His speech in Boston was merely an appeal to the vanity of the American people. Also, he thinks that treaties of peace will prove "scraps of paper" unless America joins a league. Why may not the league itself prove a scrap of paper?

He says that we have saved the Poles and the Armenians, and, therefore, we must see to it that they never "suffer again." That is a large order. The United States really cannot quite take charge of all European liberty.

Some people think that America will exercise a more beneficent influence in Europe without a league than with one. I think so myself. It is going to be much easier to discriminate between the self-determination of the Armenians and the self-determination of the Bolsheviki if we do not have to do it by interpreting a document, drawn up in the dark, but are allowed to do it by the light of truth.

Senator Borah says that the United States is going to be outvoted in this league and obliged to do a lot of things that we shall not want to do. It is possible that he may be right. There are two points —(1) Just how far are we taking charge of Europe; and (2) Just how much danger is there of our being made use of—which was not touched on by the enthusiastic President, ex-President and the rest. I marvel that serious-minded men should talk in such a slovenly and casual way about a serious matter, especially when they are addressing such sensible and practical persons as the American people.

The only kind of union we ought to have with Europe is the era of good feeling which we have been so effectively promoting. A brotherhood of mutual ideals? Yes. But a league on paper? Never!

JOHN JAY CHAPMAN.
New York, Feb. 28, 1919.

Satisfy Mr. Taft's Curiosity

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The Declaration of Independence added one to the family of nations. The Constitution settles the relations of the states inter se. It also settles the relationship of the government of the United States to the people under the Constitution and expresses in that regard the powers of Congress and the President. Mr. Taft is, therefore, not without excuse in asking for the provision of the Constitution which the draft of Mr. Wilson's league of nations violates. Mr. Taft should be referred, first, to the Declaration of Independence. Neither Congress nor the Senate can surrender any part of our independence as declared, whatever the Constitution may say, unless Congress have the definite power within it to make such surrender. But the Constitution does make a provision touching and concerning this matter. In the several amendments which Jefferson was instrumental in proposing and having adopted, there occurs the following:

"Article X. The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people."

It is manifest, therefore, to the extent the proposed league of nations will surrender any of the powers or independence of the nation or the states or the people thereof, that Congress is powerless to adopt it. The league must be adopted by the people, to whom is reserved by the Constitution the power to surrender the independence of the United States of America as a nation.

HERBERT A. DRAKE.
Camden, N. J., Feb. 28, 1919.

The President's Grave Responsibility

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The Constitution of the United States provides that the power to declare war is vested in Congress. Treaties of peace are the work jointly of the President and of the Senate. Those provisions were not accidents. Those who were drafting the Constitution had before them the history of all prior wars since the Middle Ages. The head of the government—king, emperor or sultan—had always possessed the power to declare war. Foreign affairs were his particular province. Ministers, ambassadors and consuls were the representatives of the king, not of the country. The army was the king's army, never the army of the people nor of the country.

Very wisely, our forefathers decided that we should not start our foreign relations upon any such basis, and consequently the power of making war was vested in the Congress and not in the President; and the power to make peace was vested not in the President alone, but in the President and Senate; and the power to appoint ambassadors or ministers was in the President, with the limitation of approval by the Senate.

Every President up to the present time has recognized the clear legal limitation upon his powers in respect to war making and peace treaties, and has consequently made some important member or members of the Senate, usually the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the majority and the ranking member of that committee of the minority direct parties with him in the negotiation of a peace.

At the White House the President said the constitution of the league of nations must be accepted, as it would be so integral part of the peace treaty and would be referred to frequently in the peace treaty and as a part of it; furthermore, that the constitution of the league of nations must be accepted in almost identically its present form, "amendment being very difficult." I am writing this letter at this time and ask you to print it because, should it happen that the treaty of peace now being negotiated be not confirmed by the Senate, I see the Democratic platform and I hear the Democratic orators in 1920 preaching that the Republicans in the Senate are responsible for the defeat of the treaty.

When the President ignored the Senate and took the making of peace into his own hands he himself became responsible for the result in case the Senate did not see fit to approve the work which he had done.

ANDREW COLVIN.
New York, Feb. 27, 1919.

Abas the Monroe Doctrine

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is a burning question throughout the whole country to-day whether the United States shall accept the constitution of the league of nations as a substitute for the Monroe Doctrine or shall the Monroe Doctrine be recognized as part of international law and be definitely assured?

Most of the South American republics look upon the Monroe Doctrine with contempt. War and unthinkable disturbance in this continent will be the inevitable outcome if these people be constantly annoyed by the aggressive policy of the Monroe Doctrine until their distrustful spirit will grow into desperate hatred. The annexation of Texas in 1845; the attempt of President Johnson to acquire Cuba; the declaration of Secretary Olney that the United States was sovereign in America; the threat of war on Colombia and the immediate recognition of the Panama independence; the acquisition of protectorship over the Dominican Republic as a demand of a bankruptcy receiver, and a number of other like instances are still deeply resented by the people of the small American republics. In fact, the United States has repeatedly committed the very act that she has tried so hard to prevent the European powers from exercising. Whatever may have been the justification for her acts, she cannot very well convince the world that her adherence to the Monroe Doctrine was entirely for the protection of the interests of her sister republics rather than that of her own.

In this critical moment of the world reconstruction there is little reason why the people of the United States to-day should still persistently maintain an antique policy which was only adopted at a time of emergency and has thereafter undergone a fundamental change in its value, and which has, as a matter of fact, become challengeable and even obnoxious in the eyes of their American sister nations as well as the European powers. Why can't the guarantee of the political independence and territorial integrity of these small republics be intrusted to the guardianship of the league of nations in which the United States is an active member?

YE YOUNG CHAU.
Columbia University, Feb. 28, 1919.

Need of Leadership

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Your editorial of yesterday, "The Great Silence," was certainly the best thing that I have seen for a long time. I have heard a number of emphatic comments regarding same.

As one of the oldest, most patriotic and most courageous newspapers in this country, it is not possible for you to take a more emphatic and vigorous lead in denouncing this silly, meandering and worthless talk about sudden discoveries of things which our grandfathers knew when they were born, and being seized upon now by certain eminent public men as a trick to catch the public fancy, a sort of heroic stimulus for the voting public? Articles like the above mentioned are considerable balm to some of us who still retain our admiration and belief in early American principles. The time certainly is ripe, and there is a crying need at this very moment for leadership of this kind. If I am not mistaken, The Tribune has taken just such a leadership at even less serious times on other occasions.

Congress is just now paying the penalty for having "done those things which it ought not to have done, and leaving undone those things which it ought to have done." Now that Roosevelt is gone, some one must lead; who else is there but you?

JOHN D. LAWSON.
New York, Feb. 27, 1919.

Take Your Choice

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Senator Lewis, in his defence of the league of nations, makes some startling statements.

He tells us that America is an island threatened on every side by the most deadly enemies, who are awaiting the first opportunity to pounce on us. From the Pacific by the "mystic people of the East," whose enmity we have incurred by "long affront and indignity of years against their nation." By the Baltic with a "maddened Russia in frenzied hatred of us." By the Atlantic, "whose tides summon every ancient European grudge," and by our own Panama Canal, "whose every singing wave echoes the distrust of Central and South America."

Whew! It almost takes our breath away. We never dreamed we had so many deadly enemies. But we feel decidedly relieved when we turn to President Wilson's Boston speech. The Senator's great chief does not seem to agree with his whip. For he assures us that "every nation in the world looks upon America as the hope of the world." That "the United States is the only nation whose motives are not suspected by the other nations." This exceedingly complimentary opinion he attributes to the fact of America's entrance into the war when it was three years old, thereby proving that we were the only nation which entered it from purely unselfish motives. We rather regret that Mr. Wilson mentioned this fact; we don't care to be reminded that it took our unselfish motives so long to get in working order. But anyway, we can breathe easier and are not nearly so scared as we were after reading Senator Lewis's speech.

But seriously, cannot Senator Lewis see that by trying to coerce the Senate by dire prophecies he is putting arguments into the mouths of its opponents? If these things are really true, what would our one poor little vote amount to among such deadly and implacable foes? Truly we are in the fix of the fly, invited to walk into the parlor that we may be dismembered by the spiders.

I saw considerable of a young Colombian during the fall and winter preceding our entrance into the war. We had in the house several pictures of Mr. Roosevelt, and I noticed his face darken when he looked at them. One day he broke out into a violent denunciation of Roosevelt and an equally extravagant eulogy of Wilson. I said, "I suppose you dislike Mr. Roosevelt on account of the Panama Canal, and you like Mr. Wilson because he proposes to give you $25,000,000?" "Yes," he assented eagerly. "Mr. Roosevelt was a dictator and a tyrant; Mr. Wilson is a great statesman, and if he had been President we would never have had a Panama Canal."

Rather a doubtful compliment for Mr. Wilson. I said, "Just think what an advantage it will be to you and to the world." "Oh," he replied, with a shrug, "we cared nothing for that; we did not need the canal, we had always got along without it; if the world wanted it, let them pay for it."

The advocates of the league will not recognize the fact that it is not the principles of the league which are opposed, but those articles which threaten our sovereignty as a nation, and we sincerely hope that the Senate will refuse to ratify the constitution until amendments are made to secure that sovereignty.

D. TURNER.
Hempstead, Feb. 27, 1919.

Washington's Picture Looks Good

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am a daily reader of The Tribune and I wish to add my commendation in a general way toward your deep and thoughtful editorials.

I own a painting of General Washington, and it seems to me I see more in that strong, well balanced and fatherly face since our idealistic and esteemed President Wilson brought out his league of nations. This league of nations has rather appealed to us Methodists, as an avenue through which the United States could be of benefit throughout the world. I doubt if the proposition appeals to us in any other way. Will this ideal stand the light of our experience? I say, No. We better follow the advice of our forefathers. They struck a solid rock foundation. The present league stands on a foundation of sand, in so far as we are concerned.

We, as a nation, have prospered beyond the attainments of any other people. When Russia, or Belgium, or other peoples have faced famine, we have helped them. We will do no less in the future—and it is doubtful if we can do more.

We are popular in Europe to-day—largely because we loaned them money, and because of prospective loans. When it comes to paying these loans and interest, we are bound to be most unpopular. Many men believe it only a matter of time when most of the loans will have to be cancelled. Let us, then, beware of ambitious men, and by our example of sobriety, firmness and mercy show others the true path to greatness. The peace treaty can settle all matters for at least twenty years ahead. Then, if the present governments exist, they will have learned the value of stability and the field will be much more fertile ground for an enduring peace.

C. F. DICKINSON.
New York, Feb. 27, 1919.

A Grand Crisis

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The President, without mandate of the people of this country and after the repudiation of his Administration, went abroad to the peace conference to thrust upon that body his scheme for a league of nations, without deigning to reveal to the American people a single item of his proposed plan. He now returns with a draft, clumsily drawn and confusing in many provisions.

But one thing stands out clearly: If the United States of America were to accept and ratify the plan as it now stands, the United States would surrender its independence and abdicate its sovereignty.

The crisis is grave, never graver in the history of our country. We are now asked to abandon not only our traditional policy of no entangling alliances, but to surrender our sovereignty as a people. Strange that a war fought to win self-determination for every nation on earth, as Mr. Wilson is fond of declaring, should eventuate, according to the terms of Mr. Wilson's league, in the loss of the self-determination of the United States. The irony of the situation would move wild laughter in the throat of death.

We are asked to "stand by the President." Let the President first stand by the country. Let him stand by its well established and proved traditional policies.

CONDE B. PALLEN.
New York, Feb. 28, 1919.

Roosevelt and the Jews

(From The Jewish Chronicle)

Other pens have done justice to the fine character and achievements of the late Mr. Roosevelt—to his virility, his political honesty and his fearless energy. As a Jewish paper, however, we cannot forbear a word of tribute to the high-minded attitude which he always adopted toward the Jewish people. He had no patience with Jew-baiters; or rather, he had a measure of patience which he used, with humorous effects, to their undoing. The well-known story of the foreign agitator who came to New York to stir up prejudice is a case in point. Roosevelt did not prohibit the man's meeting, but he stationed Jewish policemen in the hall to protect the orator of the evening. The dead statesman was not only a great American, but a great leader of men; his forceful energy and robust idealism made him a friend of all mankind. Of all the friends who have come to us from the wonderful democracy overseas, none will retain a warmer place in the Jewish heart than the splendid American now called, all too early, home.

A Week of Verse

Nostalgia

(From Poetry)

THE waning moon looks upward, this grey night
Sheers round the heavens in one smooth curve
Of easy sailing. Odd red wicks serve
To show where the ships at sea move out of sight.

This place is palpable me, for here I was born
Of this self-same darkness. Yet the shadowy house below
Is out of bounds, and only the old ghosts know
I have come—they whimper about me, welcome and mourn.

My father suddenly died in the harvesting corn,
And the place is no longer ours. Watching, I hear
No sound from the strangers; the place is dark, and fear
Opens my eyes till the roots of my vision seem torn.

Can I go nearer, never toward the door?
The ghosts and I, we mourn together, and shrink
In the shadow of the cart-shed—hovering on the brink
For ever, to enter the homestead no more.
Is it irrevocable? Can I really not go
Through the open yardway? Can I not pass the sheds
And through to the mowie? Only the dead in their beds
Can know the fearful anguish that this is so.

I kiss the stones. I kiss the moss on the wall,
And wish I could pass impregnate into the place.
I wish I could take it all in a last embrace.
I wish with my breast I could crush it, perish it all.

D. H. LAWRENCE.

To One Who Woos Fame With Me

(From The Dial)

YOU and I may dream of roses,
Flung
Like flowered kisses
Through the haze
And powdered air—
Showered
At our feet
Behind the candles of the world.
But when laughter flows away
And echoes die,
When waving candles wane
Like wearied lilies in the dusk,
When shadows fade upon the painted scene,
And voices
Raised for soft applause
Are tired grown,
Murmuring
As children's voices worn at play—
What scent of this
Will linger with the days for us?
What fragrant gift remain
Of roses carried off,
Of garlands withered overnight,
Dust
With the laden air
That midnight left behind?

RALPH BLOCK.

Bertha Kalich

(From The Pagan)

I HEARD a woman laugh last night
In a play—
A terrible, hopeless laugh.
A laugh that flung itself into the face of Destiny.
She was play-acting, and the crowds sat breathless
And still, tensely following her as she cowered
Against a tall fireplace.
The woman must have been mad. . . .
She was such a terrible, delicious woman!
Her laughter was like a cold hand from the dead
Laid in grotesque affectionateness
Fiendishly insinuating,
Diabolically tender, across your throat.

No one could have laughed so,
With such sweet malignity.
No one could have chilled the marrow so
Without the craft of madness aiding her.
. . . I know now what the Greeks meant by mania!

ARCHIE AUSTIN COATES.

The Sign

(From The London Nation)

OVER the apple trees with their red load
In world's end orchards, over dark yew woods,
O'er fires of sunset glassed in wizard streams,
O'er mill and meadow of those farthest lands,
Over the reapers, over the sere sails
Of homing ships and every breaking wave,
Over the haven and the entranced town,
Over hearths aflame with fir trunks and fir cones,
Over the children playing in the streets,
Over the harpers harping on the bridge,
O'er lovers in their dream and their desire,
There falls from the high heaven a subtle sense
Of presage and a deep expectant hush,
And the wise watchers know the time draws on
For that amid the snows of that same year
The earth will bear her longed for perfect fruit.

R. L. G.

New Year Prayer

(From The Spectator)

SO LET me live that all my days
Run onwards to unending ways,
Since down Time's corridors I see
Sure footprints to Eternity;
Remembering still that all I do
At length must run its course through
This world's dark passage, poorly lit,
Into the shining Infinite.
May all I suffer, love and learn
Light candles in God's House to burn
And make a little radiance, bright
Even in that undreamed-of Light.

RUTH M. BEDFORD.
Chester, Elizabeth Bay, Sydney, N. S. W.